REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the amendments above and the comments below. Claims 1-13, 15-22, 24-28 and 30 were pending. Within the Office Action, Claims 1-13, 15-22, 24-28 and 30 have been rejected. By the above amendments, new Claims 31 and 32 have been added. Accordingly, Claims 1-13, 15-22, 24-28 and 30-32 are now pending.

Claim Amendments

Support for the above amendments can be found within the Present Specification at least at page 5, lines 3-18 and page 7, line 3 to page 8, line 4, which discuss the searching by service and or provider as well as unique service codes. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Within the Office Action, Claims 1-13, 15-22, 24-28 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2010/0017606 to Bradley et al. (hereafter "Bradley"). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Bradley teaches systems and methods for performing policy-managed, peer-to-peer service orchestration in a manner that supports the formation of self-organizing service networks that enable rich media experiences. [Bradley, Abstract] Bradley also teaches a Notification Interest which is criteria used to determine whether a given Node will accept a given notification, and an example of a Notification Interest includes interests based on affinity groups such as new jazz club content. [Bradley, ¶ 403] However, although Bradley teaches affinity groups, Bradley does not teach *categorizing* a service in a genre using a genre record. Furthermore, Bradley does not teach *searching* for a content record through a genre record. Additionally, Bradley does not teach associating a *plurality of genres* with the service through a *plurality of genre records* and categorizing the service in the plurality of genres using the plurality of genre records. Accordingly, Bradley does not teach the presently claimed invention.

Within the Office Action, it is asserted that all of the above limitations are taught by paragraphs 92 and 94 of Bradley. Specifically, it is emphasized that paragraph 92 of Bradley teaches "[a] service description [that] is published to a registry by any number of means so that the service may be discovered." [Office Action, page 3] However, none of the above cited portions of Bradley teach or are even related to genres or a genre record. The language "any

number of means" is not sufficient to teach that a genre record or records are created for a service, that the service is categorized in a genre, or that a content record can be searched for through a genre record. Nowhere in Bradley is it taught that a service description in a registry is categorized in or even includes a genre record, much less a plurality of genre records. Similarly, nowhere is searching for content records through a genre record taught. Instead, Bradley merely generically teaches a notification framework that allows different service providers to find each other. [Bradley, ¶ 0006] Thus, Bradley does not teach *categorizing* a service in a genre using a genre record, *searching* for a content record through a genre record, or associating a *plurality of genres* with the service through a *plurality of genre records* and categorizing the service in the plurality of genres using the plurality of genre records.

Furthermore, it is not inherent that Bradley teaches genre records simply because it teaches affinity groups. Indeed, the fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic. In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 1534, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1957 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Further, "to establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence 'must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is *necessarily present* in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient.'" In re Robertson, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (citations omitted). Here, genre records of any kind are not *necessarily present* in Bradley. Instead, as discussed above, the affinity groups of Bradley are solely related to a notification interest criteria for nodes receiving notifications. They are never discussed nor even suggested as being a part of service descriptions published in a registry. As a result, it is clear that Bradley does not explicitly nor inherently teach *categorizing* a service in a genre using a genre record, *searching* for a content record through a genre record, or associating a *plurality of genres* with the service through a *plurality of genre records* and categorizing the service in the plurality of genres using the plurality of genre records. Accordingly, Bradley does not teach the presently claimed invention.

In contrast to Bradley, the claimed invention is directed to methods and apparatuses for discovery and notification of services are described for identifying a content provider, identifying a service wherein the service corresponds with the content provider, categorizing the service in a

genre using a genre record, forming a service record within the service registry wherein the service record represents the service, and allowing a content user to discover the service through the service registry. As described above, Bradley does not teach *categorizing* a service in a genre using a genre record. Furthermore, Bradley does not teach *searching* for a content record through a genre record. Additionally, Bradley does not teach associating a *plurality of genres* with the service through a *plurality of genre records* and categorizing the service in the plurality of genres using the plurality of genre records.

The independent Claim 1 is directed to a method. The method of Claim 1 comprises identifying a content provider, identifying a service wherein the service corresponds with the content provider, categorizing the service in a genre using a genre record, forming a service record within a service registry wherein the service record represents the service and allowing a content user to discover the service through the service registry. As described above, Bradley does not teach *categorizing* a service in a genre using a genre record. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Bradley.

Claims 2-11 are all dependent upon the independent Claim 1. As discussed above, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Bradley. Accordingly, Claims 2-11 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 12 is directed to a method. The method of Claim 12 comprises identifying a content user, allowing the content user to discover a service within a service registry wherein the service corresponds with a content provider, searching for a content record through a genre record, wherein the genre record corresponds to the service and displaying the content record associated with a content corresponding to the service wherein the content record provides parameter information relating to the content. As described above, Bradley does not teach searching for a content record through a genre record, wherein the genre record corresponds to the service. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 12 is allowable over the teachings of Bradley.

Claims 13 and 15-19 are all dependent upon the independent Claim 12. As discussed above, the independent Claim 12 is allowable over the teachings of Bradley. Accordingly, Claims 13 and 15-19 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 20 is directed to a method. The method of Claim 20 comprises identifying a registry system, wherein the registry system includes a plurality of records wherein each record represents a service, searching for a service within the registry system based on a search criteria comprising a genre type describing the category of the service and displaying at

least one record in response to the search criteria. As described above, Bradley does not teach searching for a service within the registry system based on a search criteria comprising a genre type describing the category of the service. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 20 is allowable over the teachings of Bradley.

Claims 21 and 22 are both dependent upon the independent Claim 20. As discussed above, the independent Claim 20 is allowable over the teachings of Bradley. Accordingly, Claims 21 and 22 are both also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 24 is directed to a registry system comprising a storage module configured for storing a provider record and a service record wherein, the provider record represents a content provider and a service associated with the content provider and the service record represents the service associated with the content provider, and further wherein the storage module is configured for storing a genre record for describing a category of the service and a control module configured for selectively allowing access to the provider record and the service record based on access rights of a content user. As described above, Bradley does not teach storing a genre record for describing a category of the service. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 24 is allowable over the teachings of Bradley.

Claims 25-28 are all dependent upon the independent Claim 24. As discussed above, the independent Claim 24 is allowable over the teachings of Bradley. Accordingly, Claims 25-28 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 30 is directed to a method. The method of Claim 30 comprises identifying a content provider, identifying a service wherein the service corresponds with the content provider, associating a plurality of genres with the service through a plurality of genre records, categorizing the service in the plurality of genres using the plurality of genre records, forming a service record within a service registry wherein the service record represents the service and allowing a content user to discover the service through the service registry. As described above, Bradley does not teach associating a plurality of genres with the service through a plurality of genre records and categorizing the service in the plurality of genres using the plurality of genre records. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 30 is allowable over the teachings of Bradley.

New Claims

The new independent Claim 31 is directed to a method. The method of Claim 31 comprises generating a content provider record in a registry system for a content provider,

associating a service record with the content provider record, wherein the content provider provides a service that corresponds to the service record, associating a genre record with the service record, wherein the genre record corresponds to a genre that categorizes one or more content items associated with the service and allowing a content user to discover one or more of the content items by searching the registry system by one or more of content provider, service and genre. As described above, Bradley does not teach associating a plurality of genres with the service. Furthermore, Bradley does not teach allowing a content user to discover one or more of the content items by searching the registry system by content provider or service. Instead, Bradley merely generally teaches the concept of searching for services without ever teaching or implying that services may be searched by content provider or service. [See Bradley, ¶ 0093] For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 31 is allowable over Bradley.

The new Claim 32 is dependent on the independent Claim 31. As described above, the independent Claim 31 is allowable over Bradley. Accordingly, Claim 32 is also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim. Furthermore, Claim 32 recites wherein each service record has a unique service identification code that identifies a service type. Nowhere in Bradley is it taught that each of the services has a unique identification code that identifies a service type. For at least this additional reason, Claim 32 is allowable over Bradley.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in a condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the Examiner encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

<div style="text-align:center">

Respectfully submitted,

HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

</div>

Dated: December 20, 2010   By: /Jonathan O. Owens/

<div style="text-align:center">

Jonathan O. Owens
Reg. No.: 37,902
Attorneys for Applicants

</div>